07 Civ. 8813 (RWS)

DECLARATION OF JOHN A. ORZEL IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S M OTION TO VACATE MARITIME ATTACHMENT

Exhibit E

Page 2 of 3

person! 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA 9 10 PROSHIPLINE, INC., EP-TEAM, INC., 11 Plaintiffs, Case No. C07-5660FDB 12 ٧. ORDER DENYING PROSHIPLINE'S 13 ASPEN INFRASTRUCTURES, LTD., f/k/a MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION and ORDERING RELEASE OF SUZLON INFRASTRUCTURE, LTD., 14 FUNDS IN THE COURT'S REGISTRY Defendants. 15 MASTERS AND PURSERS OF THE M/S 16 MARGARETHA GREEN, et al. 17 Garnishees. 18 On March 28, 2008, this Court granted Aspen's motion to vacate the Rule B garnishments 19 and to exonerate the security. On April 7, 2008, Plaintiffs ProShipLine and EP-Team (hereafter, 20 collectively PSL) moved for reconsideration and/or for stay pending review. On April 14, 2008, 21 Aspen filed a Praecipe requesting the Clerk to release the security to Aspen as ordered on March 28, 22 2008. Also on April 14, 2008, PSL moved for preservation of the security and for stay pending 23 review of the motion for reconsideration. As requested, Aspen filed its response to PSL's motion for 24 reconsideration combined with a response to PSL's request for stay. 25 ORDER - 1

PSL challenges the Court's authority to order the return of the full market value of the bunkers attached, that the order fails to account for the amount deposited into the Court's registry, argues the question of jurisdiction, that an improper burden has been imposed upon Plaintiffs, proper procedure under Rule B, and that *res judicata* has no application in this case.

Aspen has responded addressing PSL's arguments.

Having considered PSL's arguments and Aspen's response thereto, this Court is not convinced to reconsider its Order Granting Aspen's Motion to Vacate Rule B

Attachments/Garnishments and To Exonerate Security. For the reasons stated in Aspen's Combined Response, the PSL's motion for reconsideration and motion for stay will be denied. The parties had agreed that the value of the bunkers attached and removed was \$93,040.56. Bunker sale proceeds of \$64,129.50 was deposited by Plaintiffs into the Court's Registry; \$28,092.06 is the remainder that Plaintiffs owe Aspen.

## NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED:

- 1. ProShipLine and EP-Team's Motion for Reconsideration and/or for Stay Pending Review (Dkt. # 96) is DENIED;
- ProShipLine and EP-Team's Motion for Order Regarding Preservation of Security
   Pending Review and for stay (Dkt. # 99) is DENIED;
- The Clerk is Ordered to release the substitute security of \$64,129.50 in the Court's Registry and ProShipLne and EP-Team shall pay the remaining \$28,092.06 owing to Aspen as directed in the Court's Order entered March 28, 2008.

DATED this 17th day of April, 2008.

FRANKLIN D. BURGESS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE